



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,046	07/12/2001	Christine Cheng	2043.258US1	3861

49845 7590 02/14/2008
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/EBAY
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

OYEBISI, OJO O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3696

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

02/14/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@SLWIP.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/905,046	Applicant(s) CHENG ET AL.	
	Examiner OJO O. OYEBISI	Art Unit 3694	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/05/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-6, 31-36, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Trostle (US PAT: 5,919,257).

Re claims 1 and 2. Trostle teaches a method to detect fraudulent activities at a network-based transaction facility, the method comprising: causing a first identifier (i.e., authorized username) associated with a first user identity to be stored on a machine responsive to a first sales-related event with respect to the network-based transaction facility and initiated under the first user identity from the machine which is coupled to the network-based transaction facility via a network; and detecting a potentially fraudulent activity by detecting a lack of correspondence (i.e., In response, the user enters a username which is transmitted to the server and in step 84 the server compares the entered username against a list of authorized users. If the username is not valid, network access is denied in step 86 and the login process ends, see col.5 lines 45-55) between the first identifier stored on the machine and a second identifier (i.e., entered username) associated with a second user identity responsive to a second sales-related event with respect to the network-based transaction facility and initiated

Art Unit: 3694

under the second user identity from the machine (i.e., In step 82 a username prompt is presented to the user. In response, the user enters a username which is transmitted to the server and in step 84 the server compares the entered username against a list of authorized users. If the username is not valid, network access is denied in step 86 and the login process ends. However, if the entered username is on the list, the server returns an encrypted private key to the workstation in step 88. The encrypted private key can only be decrypted with the user's password. In step 90 the server checks if any login restrictions, such as, time restrictions, station restrictions and account lock-out restrictions have been violated. These restrictions prevent logins from unauthorized workstations or logins during the wrong time of day. If there are violations, access is denied (step 86). However, if there are no login restrictions, the user is prompted to enter a password in step 92 and the validity of the password is determined in step 94, see col.5 lines 45-67).

Re claims 31-33, and 40. Claims 31-33, and 40 recite similar limitations to claim 1 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale in the rejection of claim 1.

Re claims 3 and 34. Trostle discloses a method comprising causing the lack of correspondence between the first identifier and second identifier to be detected at the machine (i.e., In response, the user enters a username which is transmitted to the server and in step 84 the server compares the entered username against a list of authorized users. If the username is not valid, network access is denied in step 86 and the login process ends, see col.5 lines 45-55).

Re claims 4-6, 35-36. Trostle further discloses a method comprising receiving both the

first identifier and the second identifier at the network-based transaction facility from the machine, and detecting the lack of correspondence between the first identifier and second identifier at the network-based transaction facility (i.e., In step 82 a username prompt is presented to the user. In response, the user enters a username which is transmitted to the server and in step 84 the server compares the entered username against a list of authorized users. If the username is not valid, network access is denied in step 86 and the login process ends. However, if the entered username is on the list, the server returns an encrypted private key to the workstation in step 88, see col.5 lines 45-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7-8, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trostle in view of Buchner et al (Buchner hereinafter, Discovering Internet marketing intelligence through online analytical web usage mining, **ACM SIGMOD Record archive**, Volume 27, Issue 4 (December 1998), Pages: 54 – 61, Year of Publication: 1998, ISSN:0163-5808).

Re claims 7-8, and 37. Trostle does not explicitly disclose a method comprising causing the first and second identifier to be stored on the machine within a cookie.

However, Buchner makes this disclosure (i.e., cookies are tokens generated by the web server and held by the clients. The information stored in a cookie log helps to ameliorate the transactionless state of the web server interactions....., the logged cookie data is customizable, which goes hand in hand with the structure and the content of the marketing data,the logged query data must be linked to the access log through cookie data and or/registration data (i.e., identifiers), see pg 55 col.2 paragraphs 2 and 3). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Buchner and Trostle to enable servers to track client access across their hosted web pages. Further, storing user identifiers on the machine within a cookie is a well-known cookie bundling scheme. Cookie bundling is a common practice wherein all of the separate cookies pertaining to different type of user transaction preferences are packed together into one file. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to introduce the well-known scheme in Trostle to enable separate cookies pertaining to different type of user transaction preferences to be packed together into one file.

5. Claims 9-19, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trostle in view of Buchner as applied to claims 8 and 37 above, and further in view of Miller (Michael Miller, The complete Idiot's Guide to Ebay Online Auctions, copyright July 1999).

Re claims 9, 10. Neither Trostle nor Buchner explicitly discloses a method wherein the first sales-related event includes one of registering with the network-based transaction facility, communicating an offer to sell an offering via the network-based transaction

Art Unit: 3694

facility, communicating and offering to purchase the offering via the network-based transaction facility, communicating a feedback regarding a transaction, and updating a profile maintained by the network-based transaction facility. However, Miller discloses a method wherein the first event includes one of registering with the network-based transaction facility (see pg 133), communicating an offer to sell an offering via the network-based transaction facility, communicating and offering to purchase the offering via the network-based transaction facility (i.e., ebay, see pg 52) communicating a feedback regarding a transaction, and updating a profile maintained by the network-based transaction facility (i.e., ebay feedback, see pgs 157-161). Thus it would have been obvious to incorporate what is taught by Miller into the combination of Trostle and Buchner to allow individuals and small businesses to sell and buy items from other internet users worldwide.

Re claims 11-14, and 38. Trostle discloses the method comprising: the detection of the lack of correspondence between the first identifier and the second identifier at one of the machine and the network-based transaction facility; inspect for the potentially fraudulent activity (i.e., In step 82 a username prompt is presented to the user. In response, the user enters a username which is transmitted to the server and in step 84 the server compares the entered username against a list of authorized users. If the username is not valid, network access is denied in step 86 and the login process ends. However, if the entered username is on the list, the server returns an encrypted private key to the workstation in step 88, see col.5 lines 45-60), and causing the potentially fraudulent activity to be recorded into a database. (i.e., If the values are equal then illicit

Art Unit: 3694

changes have not been made to the selected executables programs, and execution continues with step 90 which returns workstation execution to the system BIOS.

Otherwise, step 92 is performed to notify the user, and/or the network system administrator, that an unauthorized change has been detected. The workstation may also make an entry in an **audit server audit log**, see col.7 lines 27-38). Trostle does not explicitly disclose causing the first identifier and the second identifier to be stored on the machine within a shill cookie; causing a cookie identifier to be stored within the shill cookie; causing the shill cookie to be coupled to a cookie bundle which records a plurality of transaction preferences for the first user identity and the second user identity on the machine; causing the shill cookie bundle to be sent from the machine to the network-based transaction facility when the second user identify makes the second sales transaction event with the network-based transaction facility using the machine; causing the shill cookie to be appended with the second identifier. However, Buchner makes this disclosure (i.e., cookies are tokens generated by the web server and held by the clients. The information stored in a cookie log helps to ameliorate the transactionless state of the web server interactions....., the logged cookie data is customizable, which goes hand in hand with the structure and the content of the marketing data,the logged query data must be linked to the access log through cookie data and or/registration data (i.e., identifiers). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Trostle and Buchner to enable servers to track client access across their hosted web pages. Further, storing user identifiers on the machine within a cookie is a well-known cookie bundling scheme.

Cookie bundling is a common practice wherein all of the separate cookies pertaining to different type of user transaction preferences are packed together into one file. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to introduce the well-known scheme in Trostle to enable separate cookies pertaining to different type of user transaction preferences to be packed together into one file.

Re claim 15. Trostle discloses a method wherein the machine comprises a computer connected to the network-based transaction facility (i.e., a networked workstation performs an intrusion detection hashing function on selected workstation executable programs, see abstract).

Re claim 16. Neither Trostle nor Buchner discloses a method wherein the network-based transaction facility comprises an Internet-based auction facility. However Miller makes this disclosure (i.e., ebay, see pg 52). Thus it would have been obvious to incorporate what is taught by Miller into combination of Trostle and Buchner to allow individuals and small businesses to sell items to sell and buy items from other internet users worldwide.

Re claims 17, 18-19. Trostle does not explicitly disclose a method as in claim 16 further comprising: causing the shill cookie to record and to store a predetermined number of user identifiers. However, Buchner makes this disclosure (i.e., cookies are tokens generated by the web server and held by the clients. The information stored in a cookie log helps to ameliorate the transactionless state of the web server interactions....., the logged cookie data is customizable, which goes hand in hand with the structure and the content of the marketing data,the logged query data must be linked to the access

log through cookie data and or/registration data (i.e., identifiers). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Trostle and Buchner to enable servers to track client access across their hosted web pages.

Further, storing user identifiers on the machine within a cookie is a well-known cookie bundling scheme. Cookie bundling is a common practice wherein all of the separate cookies pertaining to different type of user transaction preferences are packed together into one file. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to introduce the well-known scheme in Trostle to enable separate cookies pertaining to different type of user transaction preferences to be packed together into one file.

6. Claims 20-30, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trostle in view of Buchner and Miller as applied to claims 19 and 38 above and further in view of Smaha et al (Smaha hereinafter, US PAT: 5,557,742).

Re claims 20-21, and 39. Neither Trostle nor combination of Buchner and Miller explicitly discloses a method further comprising: generating a potential fraudulent activities table having a fraudulent activity field, a cookie identifier field, a user identifier field, and a frequency field; recording each of the potentially fraudulent activities and corresponding information into the potential fraudulent activities table; updating the potential fraudulent activities table at least on a periodic basis; and providing an updated report of the potential fraudulent activities table to an investigation team. However, Smaha discloses generating a potential fraudulent activities table having a fraudulent activity field, a cookie identifier field, a user identifier field, and a frequency field (i.e., generate misuse report and load pre-elected fields, see fig.6B element 170

Art Unit: 3694

and element 176); recording each of the potentially fraudulent activities (i.e., misuse) and corresponding information into the potential fraudulent activities table (see fig.4 element 126); updating the potential fraudulent activities table at least on a periodic basis (i.e., once a misuse has been detected, an output mechanism generates a signal for use by notification and storage mechanism, see col.3 lines 40-45, also see col.6 lines 11-14); and providing an updated report of the potential fraudulent activities table to an investigation team (i.e., the detection system then generates a text-based output report for a user to view or stored, see col.3 lines 40-44). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Trostle, Buchner, Miller and Smaha to enable a user to store, view and analyze the fraudulent activities.

Re claim 22. Neither Trostle nor Buchner explicitly discloses a method wherein the new event includes one of registering with the network-based transaction facility, communicating an offer to sell an offering via the network-based transaction facility, communicating and offering to purchase the offering via the network-based transaction facility, communicating a feedback regarding a transaction, and updating a profile maintained by the network-based transaction facility. However, Miller discloses a method wherein the new event includes one of registering with the network-based transaction facility (see pg 133), communicating an offer to sell an offering via the network-based transaction facility, communicating and offering to purchase the offering via the network-based transaction facility (i.e., ebay, see pg 52) communicating a feedback regarding a transaction, and updating a profile maintained by the network-based transaction facility (i.e., ebay feedback, see pgs 157-161). Thus it would have

Art Unit: 3694

been obvious to incorporate what is taught by Miller into the combination of Trostle and Buchner to allow individuals and small businesses to sell and buy items from other internet users worldwide.

Re claims 23 and 24. Neither Trostle nor combination of Buchner and Miller discloses a method comprising providing the updated report to the investigation team at a predetermined time. However, Shama discloses providing the updated report to the investigation team (i.e., a user) at a predetermined time (i.e., the detection system then generates a text-based output report for a user to view or stored, see col.3 lines 40-44). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Trostle, Buchner, Miller and Shama to enable a user to store, view and analyze the fraudulent activities.

Re claim 25. Neither Trostle nor the combination of Buchner, Miller and Shama discloses a method further comprising providing a priority ranking system having a low priority for a low potential fraudulent activity frequency, a medium priority for a medium potential fraudulent activity frequency and a high priority for a high potential fraudulent activity frequency. However, it is old and well in business management art to prioritize events based on the events degree of importance. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate what is old and well known in the art into the combination of Trostle, Buchner, Miller and Shama to prioritize the frequency of fraudulent activities and to enable the system to process data more efficiently.

Re claim 26. Trostle discloses a method further comprising examining the updated report to confirm the potentially fraudulent activity (i.e., the detection system then

generates a text-based output report for a user to view or stored, see col.3 lines 40-44).

Re claim 27. Trostle discloses how fraudulent activities i.e., an authorized change to a workstation can be detected and prevented. Neither Trostle nor Buchner explicitly discloses a method wherein the potentially fraudulent activity includes one of skill biddings and skill feedbacks. However, Miller explicitly disclose a method wherein the potentially fraudulent activity includes one of skill biddings and skill feedbacks (see pg 218 and pg 222). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the intrusion detection system of Trostle to detect and prevent fraudulent activities in online auction market i.e., skill bidding and skill feedback as taught by Miller.

Re claim 28. Neither Trostle nor the combination of Buchner and Miller discloses a method wherein the recording does not affect any one of the first sales related event, the second sales event, and the new event. However Smaha makes this disclosure (i.e., a method for using processing system inputs to form events, processing the events by the misuse engine according to a set of selectable misuses, and generating one or more misuse outputs. The method converts system-generated inputs to events by establishing a first data structure for use by the system which stores the event. The data structure has elements including (1) authentication information; (2) subject information; and (3) object information. The method further extracts from system audit trail records, system log file data, and system security state data the information necessary for the first data structure. The method includes the steps of storing the events into the first data structure, see col.12 line 65 – col.13 line10). Thus it would

have been obvious to combine the teachings of Trostle, Buchner, Miller and Smaha to detect and prevent fraudulent activities in online auction market.

Re claim 29. Trostle further discloses a method further comprising causing the detection of the potentially fraudulent activity responsive a matching of at least two user transaction preferences from at least two different user identifies (i.e., In step 82 a username prompt is presented to the user. In response, the user enters a username which is transmitted to the server and in step 84 the server compares the entered username against a list of authorized users. If the username is not valid, network access is denied in step 86 and the login process ends. However, if the entered username is on the list, the server returns an encrypted private key to the workstation in step 88. The encrypted private key can only be decrypted with the user's password. In step 90 the server checks if any login restrictions, such as, time restrictions, station restrictions and account lock-out restrictions have been violated. These restrictions prevent logins from unauthorized workstations or logins during the wrong time of day. If there are violations, access is denied (step 86). However, if there are no login restrictions, the user is prompted to enter a password in step 92 and the validity of the password is determined in step 94, see col.5 lines 45-67).

Re claim 30. Neither Trostle nor Buchner discloses a method wherein the user transaction preferences comprise credit card numbers, bidding histories, payment methods, and shipping addresses. However, Miller makes this disclosure (see pg 23). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the

teachings of Trostle, Buchner and Miller to detect and prevent fraudulent activities in online auction market.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 04/30/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues in substance that the primary reference, Trostle, fails to teach the limitations: detecting a potentially fraudulent activity by detecting the lack of correspondence between a first identifier stored on a machine and a second identifier; and storing a first user identity responsive to a first sales-related event with respect to the network-based transaction facility. Contrary to the applicant's assertion, Trostle discloses in col.5 lines 45-67 i.e., " in step 82, a username prompt is presented to the user. In response, the user enters a username which is transmitted to the server and in step 84 the server compares the entered username against a list of authorized users. If the username is not valid, network access is denied in step 86 and the login process ends. However, if the entered username is on the list, the server returns an encrypted private key to the workstation in step 88. The encrypted private key can only be decrypted with the user's password. In step 90 the server checks if any login restrictions, such as, time restrictions, station restrictions and account lock-out restrictions have been violated. These restrictions prevent logins from unauthorized workstations or logins during the wrong time of day. If there are violations, access is denied (step 86). However, if there are no login restrictions, the user is prompted to enter a password in step 92 and the validity of the password is determined in step 94."

Art Unit: 3694

Clearly, in col.5 lines 45-67, Trostle is describing an authentication process wherein a user identity (i.e., username) is compared to pre-stored user information, and if a match is not found between the entered username and the pre-stored information, network access is denied to the said user, and the log-in process terminates. Thus, the examiner perceives the authentication process described by Trostle in col.5 lines 45-67 to constitute the applicant's claimed limitations i.e., "storing a first user identity responsive to a first sales-related event with respect to the network-based transaction facility; detecting a potentially fraudulent activity by detecting the lack of correspondence between a first identifier stored on a machine and a second identifier." All in all, the authentication process disclosed by Trostle supra reads on these limitations. The examiner contends that the pre-stored username and the entered username constitute applicant claimed first user identity and second user identity. In Trostle, the entered username is matched/compared to the prestored username to detect correspondence. If the two identities or identifiers match the user is allowed to proceed but if the two identifiers do not match, then user is denied access. Thus this authentication process as described by Trostle supra constitutes applicant's claimed limitation of detecting the lack of correspondence between a first identifier stored on a machine and a second identifier.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OJO O. OYEBISI whose telephone number is (571)272-8298. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30A.M-5:30P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAMES TRAMMELL can be reached on (571)272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Art Unit: 3694

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

o.o

/Ella Colbert/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3694

Application Number 	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination	
	09/905,046	CHENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	OJO O. OYEBISI	3694	